

Application No.: 10/781,630  
Attorney Docket No.: 64373.000542

## **REMARKS**

These Remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed on October 3, 2005 (the "Office Action"). The Applicant extends his appreciation for the examiners detailed review of the present application and respectfully requests reconsideration of the claim rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

### ***Status of the Claims***

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-26 were pending in the application. Claims 1-9, 11-23 and 25-26 currently stand rejected, and claims 10 and 24 are objected to. Claims 10 and 22-24 are hereby canceled, and claims 1 and 17 are amended. After entry of this Amendment, claims 1-9, 11-21 and 25-26 will be pending in the application.

### ***Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-23, and 25-26***

Claims 1-2, 5 and 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0123254 to Brass, *et al.* Claims 1 and 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,102,552 to Tullis. Claims 1-9, 11-23 and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,722,771 to Stephens in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/01653804 to Chew. Claims 10 and 24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. However, the Examiner indicated that claims 10 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 10 and should therefore be allowable for at least the reasons indicated by the Examiner with respect to claim 10. Claims 2-9 and 11-16 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 1-9 and 11-16.

Application No.: 10/781,630  
Attorney Docket No.: 64373.000542

Claim 17 is amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 24 and intervening claim 22. Claim 24 originally recited the limitation that "the second direction diverges from the first direction or converges with the first direction." This limitation has been clarified, and claim 17 now recites the limitation that "the second direction is not parallel with the first direction." Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is allowable for at least the reasons indicated by the Examiner with respect to claim 24. Claims 18-21 and 25-26 depend from claim 17 and are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 17 is allowable. Applicant requests removal of the rejection of claims 17-21 and 25-26.

### CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections and objections in the Office Action have been addressed by the amendments and remarks above. Accordingly, reconsideration and the timely issue of a Notice of Allowance are requested. If the Examiner believes prosecution might be advanced by discussing the application with Applicant's counsel, in person or over the telephone, Applicant's counsel welcome the opportunity.

No fees are believed to be due in conjunction with this Amendment; however, if any fees are due, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,  
Hunton & Williams, LLP



Robert D. Spendlove  
Registration No. 53,629

Dated: January 3, 2006

Hunton & Williams LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109  
Telephone (202) 955-1500  
Facsimile (202) 778-2201